



Minnesota
STATE COLLEGES
& UNIVERSITIES

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

WELLS FARGO PLACE
30 7TH ST. E., SUITE 350
ST. PAUL, MN 55101-7804

ph 651.201-1800
fx 651.297.5550
www.mnscu.edu

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 31, 2015

TO: Edward R. Smith
Chief, Program Administration Branch
Division of Academic and Technical Education
Office of Career Technical and Adult Education
U.S. Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW
Potomac Center Plaza, Room 11060
Washington, DC 20202-7241

FROM: JoAnn Simser, State Director Career and Technical Education

SUBJECT: Request to Extend Minnesota State Plan 2008-2013

*JoAnn Simser
March 31, 2015*

Minnesota requests an extension of the 2008-2013 Minnesota State Plan through program year seven 2013-2014, program year eight 2014-2015 and program year nine 2015-2016, to receive a program year nine grant award under Title I of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV).

Minnesota is submitting the items listed below for verification of this request:

- Accountability Targets for 2014-2015, Secondary
 - FAUPL Revision Request for 1S1 Attainment of Academic Skills-Reading/Language Arts
 - FAUPL Revision Request for 1S2 – Attainment of Academic Skills-Mathematics
 - FAUPL Revision Request for 5S1 – Placement
 - FAUPL Revision Request for 6S1 – Nontraditional Participation
- Budget for 2015-2016
- Narrative: The edits submitted for this State Plan Narrative revisions report cover MN State Plan Section III Statutory Requirements, Item 2 (a.-m.), pages 32-40 and Section IV Accountability and Evaluation Item 3, page 69 found at http://cte.mnscu.edu/MN_State_Plan/documents/Revised_plan_for_web_.pdf. The items listed below are to be added to each of the already existing sections of the MN State Plan.
 - III. Statutory Requirements
 - 2 (a.) MN Programs of Study
 - Secondary CTE Program Approval
 - Perkins Consortium Plans and Annual Reports

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities system is an Equal Opportunity employer and educator.

- 2. (g.ii) Promote continuous improvement of technical skill attainment
 - MN Technical Skill Assessment Plan Phase II
- 2 (g. iii) Identify and address current or emerging occupational opportunities
 - Itasca Project: Wanted Analytics and EMSI
 - LMIWise Workforce Information System
 - Employer Engagement Plan
- 2 (h.) How programs at secondary level prepare CTE Students, including Special Populations, for graduation
 - MN legislation and plan for expanded services to Alternative Learning Centers
- 2 (i.) Preparation of all CTE students for postsecondary CTE and student awareness of opportunities.
 - Minnesota Career Pathways: Career and Course Planning for Adults
www.mncareerpathways.org
 - MN Programs of Study Career Planning Tool
<http://mnprogramsofstudy.org/>
- Section Four, Accountability and Evaluation, item 3

We are not submitting:

- FAUPL revision requests for secondary indicators 2S1, 3S1, 4S1, or 6S2 or any postsecondary indicators for 2015-2016;
- FAUPL revision requests for any secondary indicators or any postsecondary indicators for 2014-2015;
- Any requests for changes in definitions of secondary and postsecondary participant and concentrator
- Narrative for changes in sections of the State Plan other than those listed above.

Minnesota State Plan — Narrative Revisions

Name of changed section:

MN State Plan Narrative Revisions 2015-16

Description of change:

The edits submitted for this State Plan Narrative revisions report covers MN State Plan Section III Statutory Requirements, Item 2 a.-m., pages 32-40. Readers may reference this section of the MN State Plan at http://cte.mnscu.edu/MN_State_Plan/documents/Revised_plan_for_web.pdf. The items listed below are to be added to each of the already existing sections of the MN State Plan.

III. Statutory Requirements

2. You must describe the career and technical education activities to be assisted that are designed to meet or exceed the State adjusted levels of performance.

Name of changed section:

2.a. Career and Technical Education Programs of Study

Description of change:

Minnesota Programs of Study

MN Programs of Study provide students with pathways that address the necessary sequence of academic and technical courses. Each local Perkins Consortium is required to have a minimum of seven programs of study and at least one Rigorous Program of Study in place. Minnesota created a Rigorous Program of Study Manual with templates that address the sequence of academic courses from high school to postsecondary. More information and a link to the Rigorous Program of Study handbook are located on the MN CTE website at <http://cte.mnscu.edu/programs/index.html>. Program of Study professional development workshops are offered annually at the Perkins Consortium Leaders one-day meeting and at the CTE,Works! statewide conference.

MN CTE maintains www.mnprogramsofstudy.org, a career guidance tool for students, educators and parents. The tool provides information about academic and CTE courses available at high schools statewide and about how to plan a career pathway by choosing both academic and CTE courses. Technical assistance is regularly provided to local consortia to address the alignment of academic and technical CTE standards and how to use the tools available.

Secondary CTE Program Approval

At the secondary level, local education district CTE programs support the alignment of CTE and academics through annual state CTE program reviews and 5 year program approvals. State CTE specialists as the Minnesota Department of Education encourage districts to leverage learning and Minnesota Academic Standards within CTE, monitor academic coursework in CTE programs, and provide technical assistance to local school districts to assure alignment.

Perkins Consortium Plans and Annual Reports

Perkins consortia, are required to report annually on the work they are doing locally to integrate academics with CTE and to include this work in their annual plans. Several Perkins Consortia implement cross-discipline Math-in-CTE programs that involve both CTE and liberal arts faculty.

Name of changed section:

2.g.ii. Promote continuous improvement of technical skill attainment

Description of the change:

The Minnesota State Plan for Perkins IV states that technical skill assessments will be identified for use in all state approved programs of study by 2014; this goal was accomplished. The Minnesota Technical Skill Assessment project was implemented in 2010 to assure the quality CTE programs, through the use of technical skill assessments in all state approved programs of study, which are based on the Rigorous Program of Study framework and its supporting elements.

During FY14, Minnesota continued a process, initiated in 2010 for engaging secondary and postsecondary educators and business and industry leaders, to review the core competencies and identify potential technical skill assessments appropriate for programs of study by career pathway. To date, Minnesota has completed the process of identifying core competencies and technical skill assessments for the 60 career pathways identified as appropriate for the State. By FY14, over 600 teachers and faculty developed and over 200 business and industry leaders validated state approved core competencies and third party assessments. School districts and colleges may use assessments on the approved list to meet the technical skill attainment core indicators. More information on the process and the complete list of state approved secondary and postsecondary core competencies, technical skill assessments and assessment blueprints in 60 career pathways may be found at <http://www.cte.mnscu.edu/programs/mntsa.html>

In 2015-16, MN will be moving forward with Phase II of the Technical Skill Attainment project by returning to the beginning of the list of the 60 career pathways and reevaluating competencies and identified technical skill assessments being used in secondary and postsecondary CTE classrooms and programs.

Name of changed section:

2.g.iii. Identify and address current or emerging occupational opportunities

Description of change:

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) initiated an employer-led civic alliance called the Itasca Project, a plan aimed at meeting workforce needs. While participating in this project, MnSCU institutions will use two software programs, WANTED Analytics and EMSI, to view regional and statewide statistics on top occupations, employers and desired skill sets.

The first program, WANTED Analytics, utilizes data to guide overall workforce strategy, gives access to key HR metrics statewide and lists the average salaries for particular fields in each area, among other information. WANTED Analytics displays the main job demographics for a specific region.

The second program, EMSI, helps organizations understand the connection between economies, people and work and will be used for job forecasting. The program utilizes government data and predicts which jobs will grow in demand and popularity.

MnSCU also collaborated with the MN Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED) to develop LMIwise, a workforce information system that delivers regional supply and demand information to MnSCU institutions for academic program planning and review. <https://www.iseek.org/lmiwise/> There is a growing need for CTE educators and employers to work together for their mutual benefit toward meeting Minnesota's workplace needs for employees, especially in high demand sectors where there are unmet needs. To address the need, the MN Perkins State Leadership Team launched a sustained Employer Engagement Initiative to provide professional development for CTE educators on strategies for

engaging employers to improve the content and delivery of CTE programs. The sustained professional development began in FY and will continue into FY16 and includes the following:

- * March 5, 2015 Employer Engagement Summit at Anoka Technical College
- * April 23, 2015- Recruiting Partners Webinar * May 20, 2015- Advisory Committees Webinar
- * June 17, 2015- Partnership Design and Evaluation Webinar
- * Fall 2015 Two Regional Employer Engagement Summits at Central Lakes College (for northern Consortia) and Riverland Community and Technical College (for southern Consortia)
- * November 2015 CTE Works! Conference Employer Engagement Breakout Sessions
- * Spring 2016 Three Regional Summits of Educator/Agency/Business Sector Teams Working together with employers as partners on the teams to create or improve career pathways

We anticipate that employer engagement will be an area of continued growth and use of Perkins resources.

Name of changed section:

2. i. How such programs will prepare all CTE students for postsecondary CTE and make them aware of opportunities.

Description of change:

Two new career information websites were created to assist all students, including special populations and adults, with identifying and implementing programs of study that would lead to high skill, high wage and high demand employment.

Minnesota Career Pathways: Career and Course Planning for Adults

Introducing MN Career Pathways: Your Success Starts Here, a self-service website that facilitates career and course planning for adult learners. The site is a user-friendly tool that curates information specific to adults in one place. The website does not duplicate information found on other career resources, instead it gathers career, education, and training information in one easy place for the adult learner.

<http://www.mncareerpathways.org/pathways//index.html>

MN Programs of Study

MN Programs of Study: an Academic and Career Planning Tool for High School Students Use this website to learn what combination of classes and activities will help you prepare for your future. Do a search by high school, college or career pathway to get started. Check out the website at www.mnprogramsofstudy.org.

Name of changed section:

2.h. How programs at secondary level prepare CTE students including Spec Pops to graduate from high school

Description of change:

New legislation in Minnesota in FY14 extended Postsecondary Options and Concurrent Enrollment opportunities to students enrolled in secondary Alternative Learning Centers (ALC). Perkins staff will be working with ALC's through FY15 and into FY16 to establish or improve Programs of Study, CTE classes and concurrent enrollment opportunities for students enrolled in Alternative Learning Centers.

Name of changed section:

Section Four Accountability and Evaluation, item 5

Description of change:

MN has submitted FAUPL Revision Forms for indicators 1S1, 1S2, 5S1 and 6S1 for 2015-2016. The general description of the change is repeated here. Additional information was submitted in the accountability section 2a of this plan.

1S1: 8. General description of the change (How does this affect student outcomes/performance?): FY2014-15 marks the last year that the GRAD portion of the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) is available as a measure of academic attainment in Reading. We have identified two measures: the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) and the Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) that will replace the GRAD. The majority of students in Minnesota take the MCA; however, many of our Special Education students take the MTAS.

Additionally, this measure will now include participants and concentrators. This will help us align state/district achievement efforts with the work carried out in CTE courses. By including more districts and students in this indicator we will be maintaining our high expectations while also communicating the importance and value of aligning our CTE work with statewide achievement efforts.

Because this leads to a change in the definition for this indicator, the target for FY2015-16 will also need to be updated. The target we are proposing is the best baseline estimate available to us, in consideration of the historical performance of CTE students participating in the MCA and MTAS Reading assessments as well as the data trends in the statewide average. For example, new Reading standards were implemented in FY2013 which lead to a decrease in outcomes. Also, as a result of U.S. Department of Education regulations that require states to discontinue alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, MCA-Modified (MOD) will no longer be offered in spring of 2015 or thereafter. Most likely, the MOD students will be assessed using the MTAS which may lead to a slight decrease in the trend data for this indicator.

1S2: FY2014-15 marks the last year that the GRAD portion of the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) is available as a measure of academic attainment in Mathematics. We have identified two measures: the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) and the Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) that will replace the GRAD. The majority of students in Minnesota take the MCA; however, many of our Special Education students take the MTAS.

Additionally, this measure will include participants and concentrators. This will help us align state/district achievement efforts with the work carried out in CTE courses. By including more districts and students in this indicator we will be maintaining our high expectations while also communicating the importance and value of aligning our CTE work with statewide achievement efforts.

Because this leads to a change in the definition for this indicator, the target for FY2015-16 will also need to be updated. The target we are proposing is the best baseline estimate available to us, in consideration of the historical performance of CTE students participating in the MCA and MTAS Mathematics assessments as well as the data trends in the statewide average. For example, new Reading standards were implemented in FY2013 which lead to a decrease in outcomes. Also, as a result of U.S. Department of Education regulations that require states to discontinue alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, MCA-Modified (MOD) will no longer be offered in spring of 2015 or thereafter. Most likely, the MOD students will be assessed using the MTAS which may lead to a slight decrease in the trend data for this indicator.

5S1: SLEDS is a data warehouse developed for the purpose of tracking high school to college transitions. Because this information includes nationwide data we will be better able to measure outcomes for CTE students.

The degree to which CTE students move out of state to attend postsecondary is unknown, though we hope using nationwide data will have a positive impact on this indicator. Additionally, across this next year we will be taking a closer look at the methodology used to compile these data and potentially making adjustments. Although the definition of the 5S1 indicator will remain as described above, the methodological adjustments will have an unknown impact. We are aiming to balance the increase we experience during the FY2013-14 reporting cycle with the proposed methodological changes which we hope will further increase the precision.

6S1: Word change from “participants” to “students;” and from “participated in” to “enrolled in” a CTE program. It is not anticipated that this change in wording will affect student outcomes or performance. The reason we are making this word change is to more accurately reflect the analysis currently being conducted. For the purposes of this indicator, a “CTE student” is defined as any student currently enrolled in a CTE course.

The root-cause of our ‘lower than expected performance for the 6S1 indicator’ has recently been identified; there is an immediate need to align our current data systems. During this coming year we will be working with all haste to align our data systems in order to provide better cohesion and precision. Accomplishing this work will involve an in-depth review process aimed at engaging many vested parties in discussions around nontraditional courses, as well as closely examining trend data and nontraditional information from the National Alliance for Partnership in Equity (NAPE).

2015 Minnesota State Plan Revisions:

- 1) The State Plan does contain revisions to the 2015-2016 FAUPL:
 - a) FAUPL Revision Request for 1S1 Attainment of Academic Skills-Reading/Language Arts
 - b) FAUPL Revision Request for 1S2 – Attainment of Academic Skills-Mathematics
 - c) FAUPL Revision Request for 5S1 – Placement
 - d) FAUPL Revision Request for 6S1 – Nontraditional Participation
- 2) The State Plan does not contain any revisions to the 2014-2015 FAUPL.
- 3) The State Plan does not contain any revisions to Student Definitions.
- 4) The State Plan does contain a Budget for 2015-2016
- 5) The State Plan does contain revisions to the narrative for 2015-2016. matters pertaining to the administration of their CTE program (e.g., new technical skill assessments, changes to the Program of Study model, required and permissive uses of funds, etc.).

Narrative: The edits submitted for this State Plan Narrative revisions report cover MN State Plan http://cte.mnscu.edu/MN_State_Plan/documents/Revised_plan_for_web_.pdf, Section III Statutory Requirements, Item 2 (a.-m.), pages 32-40 and Section IV Accountability and Evaluation Item 3, page 69. The items listed below are to be added to each of the already existing sections of the MN State Plan.

Section III. Statutory Requirements

- 2 (a.) MN Programs of Study
 - Secondary CTE Program Approval
 - Perkins Consortium Plans and Annual Reports
2. (g.ii) Promote continuous improvement of technical skill attainment
 - MN Technical Skill Assessment Plan Phase II
- 2 (g. iii) Identify and address current or emerging occupational opportunities
 - Itasca Project: Wanted Analytics and EMSI
 - LMIWise Workforce Information System
 - Employer Engagement Plan
- 2 (h.) How programs at secondary level prepare CTE Students, including Special Populations, for graduation
 - MN legislation and plan for expanded services to Alternative Learning Centers
- 2 (i.) Preparation of all CTE students for postsecondary CTE and student awareness of opportunities.
 - Minnesota Career Pathways: Career and Course Planning for Adults
www.mncareerpathways.org
 - MN Programs of Study Career Planning Tool
<http://mnprogramsofstudy.org/>

Section IV Accountability and Evaluation, item 3

Budget			
Line TITLE I: CAREER AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES			
1	Total Allocation to the State		
2	Total Title I Allocation to the State	\$ 16684637.00	
3	Amount of Title II Tech Prep Funds to be Consolidated with Title I Funds	\$ 0	
4	Total Amount of Combined Title I and Title II Funds to be distributed under Section 112 (line 2 + 3)	\$ 16684637.00	
5	Local Formula Distribution		
6	Local Formula Distribution (not less than 85%)	\$ 14181941.45	85.00 %
7	RESERVE		
8	Funds for Secondary Programs	\$ 595641.54	42.00 %
9	Funds for Postsecondary Programs	\$ 822552.60	58.00 %
10	Total Reserve (not more than 10% of line 6)	\$ 1418194.14	10.00 %
11	FORMULA ALLOCATIONS		
12	Funds for Secondary Programs	\$ 5360773.87	42.00 %
13	Funds for Postsecondary Programs	\$ 7402973.44	58.00 %
14	Total Available for Formula Allocations (line 12 + 13)	\$ 12763747.31	90.00 %
15	State Leadership		
16	Non-Traditional Training and Employment	\$ 60000.00	
17	Corrections or Institutions	\$ 50000.00	
18	Other State Leadership	\$ 1558463.70	
19	Total State Leadership (not more than 10%)	\$ 1668463.70	10.00 %
20	State Administration		
21	State Administration (not more than 5%)	\$ 834231.85	5.00 %
22	State Administration Match		
23	State Administration Match (from non-federal funds)	\$ 834231.85	

Minnesota - 1S1: Attainment of Academic Skills - Reading/Language Arts

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators who have met the proficient or advanced level on the Statewide high school reading/language arts assessment administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP) and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.	Number of CTE concentrators who took the ESEA assessment in reading/language arts whose scores were included in the State's computation of AYP and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.	State Academic Assessment System	62	79.41	73
2015-2016	State Proposed	Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who have met or exceeded the proficiency level on the Statewide high school Reading assessments, either the MCA or MTAS, as administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act, based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP).	Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who took the MCA or MTAS and whose high school Reading assessment scores were included in the State's computation of AYP.	State Academic Assessment System			58
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who have met or exceeded the proficiency level on the Statewide high school Reading assessments, either the MCA or MTAS, as administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act, based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP).	Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who took the MCA or MTAS and whose high school Reading assessment scores were included in the State's computation of AYP.	State Academic Assessment System			58
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators who have met the proficient or advanced level on the Statewide high school reading/language arts assessment administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP) and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.	Number of CTE concentrators who took the ESEA assessment in reading/language arts whose scores were included in the State's computation of AYP and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.	State Academic Assessment System	62	76.99	72
2014-2015	State Proposed						
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						76
2014-2015	State Counter1						73
2014-2015	OCTAE Counter1						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators who have met the proficient or advanced level on the Statewide high	Number of CTE concentrators who took the ESEA assessment in reading/language arts whose scores	State Academic Assessment System			73

Academic	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement	Baseline	Prior Year Actual	Performance
		school reading/language arts assessment administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP) and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.	were included in the State's computation of AYP and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.				

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators who have met the proficient or advanced level on the Statewide high school mathematics assessment administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP) and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.	Number of CTE concentrators who took the ESEA assessment in mathematics whose scores were included in the State's computation of AYP and who, in the reporting year, have left secondary education.	State Academic Assessment System	32	63.73	56
2015-2016	State Proposed	Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who have met or exceeded the proficiency level on the Statewide high school Mathematics assessments, either the MCA or MTAS, as administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act, based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP).	Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who took the MCA or MTAS and whose high school Mathematics assessment scores were included in the State's computation of AYP.	State Academic Assessment System			45
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who have met or exceeded the proficiency level on the Statewide high school Mathematics assessments, either the MCA or MTAS, as administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act, based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP).	Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who took the MCA or MTAS and whose high school Mathematics assessment scores were included in the State's computation of AYP.	State Academic Assessment System			45
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators who have met the proficient or advanced level on the Statewide high school mathematics assessment administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP) and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.	Number of CTE concentrators who took the ESEA assessment in mathematics whose scores were included in the State's computation of AYP and who, in the reporting year, have left secondary education.	State Academic Assessment System	32	53.25	56
2014-2015	State Proposed						
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators who have met the proficient or advanced level on the Statewide high school mathematics assessment administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of	Number of CTE concentrators who took the ESEA assessment in mathematics whose scores were included in the State's computation of AYP and who, in the reporting year, have left secondary education.	State Academic Assessment System			56

Academic	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement	Baseline	Prior Year Actual	Performance
		adequate yearly progress (AYP) and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.					

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of Secondary CTE Concentrators within Programs of Study selected by the state for which state-approved technical skill assessment instruments have been identified who attain a passing score on any of those identified technical skill assessment instruments pertinent to the Program of Study in which concentrator status is obtained.	Number of Secondary CTE Concentrators within Programs of Study selected by the state for which state-approved technical skill assessment instruments have been identified who attempt any of those identified technical skill assessment instruments pertinent to the Program of Study in which concentrator status is obtained.	3rd Party Skill Assessment, State Approved Assessments	50	60.08	54
2015-2016	State Proposed						54.1
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						60
2015-2016	State Counter1						54.3
2015-2016	OCTAE Counter1						54.3
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of Secondary CTE Concentrators within Programs of Study selected by the state for which state-approved technical skill assessment instruments have been identified who attain a passing score on any of those identified technical skill assessment instruments pertinent to the Program of Study in which concentrator status is obtained.	Number of Secondary CTE Concentrators within Programs of Study selected by the state for which state-approved technical skill assessment instruments have been identified who attempt any of those identified technical skill assessment instruments pertinent to the Program of Study in which concentrator status is obtained.	3rd Party Skill Assessment, State Approved Assessments			54.3
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of Secondary CTE Concentrators within Programs of Study selected by the state for which state-approved technical skill assessment instruments have been identified who attain a passing score on any of those identified technical skill assessment instruments pertinent to the Program of Study in which concentrator status is obtained.	Number of Secondary CTE Concentrators within Programs of Study selected by the state for which state-approved technical skill assessment instruments have been identified who attempt any of those identified technical skill assessment instruments pertinent to the Program of Study in which concentrator status is obtained.	3rd Party Skill Assessment, State Approved Assessments	50	54.76	53
2014-2015	State Proposed						
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						54
2014-2015	State Counter1						54
2014-2015	OCTAE Counter1						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of Secondary CTE Concentrators within Programs of Study selected by the state for which state-approved technical skill assessment instruments have been identified who attain a passing score on any of those identified technical skill assessment instruments pertinent to the Program of Study in which concentrator status is obtained.	Number of Secondary CTE Concentrators within Programs of Study selected by the state for which state-approved technical skill assessment instruments have been identified who attempt any of those identified technical skill assessment instruments pertinent to the Program of Study in which concentrator status is obtained.	3rd Party Skill Assessment, State Approved Assessments			54

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators who earned a regular secondary school diploma during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who left secondary education during the reporting year.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records	70	98.66	98.5
2015-2016	State Proposed						98.5
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators who earned a regular secondary school diploma during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who left secondary education during the reporting year.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records			98.5
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators who earned a regular secondary school diploma during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who left secondary education during the reporting year.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records	70	98.44	98.5
2014-2015	State Proposed						
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators who earned a regular secondary school diploma during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who left secondary education during the reporting year.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records			98.5

Minnesota - 4S1: Student Graduation Rates

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators who, in the reporting year, were included as graduated in the State's computation of its graduation rate as described in Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the ESEA.	Number of CTE concentrators who, in the reporting year, were included in the State's computation of its graduation rate as defined in the State's Consolidated Accountability Plan pursuant to Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the ESEA.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records	80	90.19	89
2015-2016	State Proposed						89
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						90
2015-2016	State Counter1						89.1
2015-2016	OCTAE Counter1						89.1
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators who, in the reporting year, were included as graduated in the State's computation of its graduation rate as described in Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the ESEA.	Number of CTE concentrators who, in the reporting year, were included in the State's computation of its graduation rate as defined in the State's Consolidated Accountability Plan pursuant to Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the ESEA.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records			89.1
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators who, in the reporting year, were included as graduated in the State's computation of its graduation rate as described in Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the ESEA.	Number of CTE concentrators who, in the reporting year, were included in the State's computation of its graduation rate as defined in the State's Consolidated Accountability Plan pursuant to Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the ESEA.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records	80	88.03	89
2014-2015	State Proposed						
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators who, in the reporting year, were included as graduated in the State's computation of its graduation rate as described in Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the ESEA.	Number of CTE concentrators who, in the reporting year, were included in the State's computation of its graduation rate as defined in the State's Consolidated Accountability Plan pursuant to Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the ESEA.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records			89

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of Secondary CTE Completers who register as participating in higher education in a data match through the Minnesota Office of Higher Education.	Number of Secondary CTE Completers.		50	66.32	54
2015-2016	State Proposed	Number of secondary CTE completers, who are registered as participating in higher education through a data match with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLEDS), which contains statewide data from the Minnesota Office of Higher Education and nationwide data from the National Clearing House.	Number of secondary CTE completers.	Postsecondary Enrollment			54.1
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of secondary CTE completers, who are registered as participating in higher education through a data match with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLEDS), which contains statewide data from the Minnesota Office of Higher Education and nationwide data from the National Clearing House.	Number of secondary CTE completers.	Postsecondary Enrollment			54.1
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of Secondary CTE Completers who register as participating in higher education in a data match through the Minnesota Office of Higher Education.	Number of Secondary CTE Completers.		50	100	54
2014-2015	State Proposed						
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of Secondary CTE Completers who register as participating in higher education in a data match through the Minnesota Office of Higher Education.	Number of Secondary CTE Completers.				54

Minnesota - 6S1: Nontraditional Participation

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE participants from underrepresented gender groups who participated in a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Number of CTE participants who participated in a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records	38	28.03	27
2015-2016	State Proposed	Number of CTE students from underrepresented gender groups who enrolled in a CTE program that leads to employment in a nontraditional field, during the current reporting year.	Number of CTE students who enrolled in a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the current reporting year.	Local Administrative Records			27
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						28
2015-2016	State Counter1						27.5
2015-2016	OCTAE Counter1						
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of CTE students from underrepresented gender groups who enrolled in a CTE program that leads to employment in a nontraditional field, during the current reporting year.	Number of CTE students who enrolled in a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the current reporting year.	Local Administrative Records			27.5
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE participants from underrepresented gender groups who participated in a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Number of CTE participants who participated in a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records	38	26.49	27
2014-2015	State Proposed						
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of CTE participants from underrepresented gender groups who participated in a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Number of CTE participants who participated in a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records			27

Minnesota - 6S2: Nontraditional Completion

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators from underrepresented gender groups who completed a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who completed a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records	35	13.33	12
2015-2016	State Proposed						12
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						13
2015-2016	State Counter1						12.5
2015-2016	OCTAE Counter1						12.5
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators from underrepresented gender groups who completed a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who completed a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records			12.5
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators from underrepresented gender groups who completed a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who completed a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records	35	12.02	12
2014-2015	State Proposed						
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators from underrepresented gender groups who completed a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who completed a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the reporting year.	Local Administrative Records, State Administrative Records			12

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators who passed technical skill assessments that are aligned with industry-recognized standards, if available and appropriate, during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who took technical skill assessments during the reporting year.	3rd Party Skill Assessment, External--TI Assessments, State Administrative Records, State Assessment Records	60	81.72	84
2015-2016	State Proposed						84
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators who passed technical skill assessments that are aligned with industry-recognized standards, if available and appropriate, during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who took technical skill assessments during the reporting year.	3rd Party Skill Assessment, External--TI Assessments, State Administrative Records, State Assessment Records			84
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators who passed technical skill assessments that are aligned with industry-recognized standards, if available and appropriate, during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who took technical skill assessments during the reporting year.	3rd Party Skill Assessment, External--TI Assessments, State Administrative Records, State Assessment Records	60	83.4	84
2014-2015	State Proposed						
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators who passed technical skill assessments that are aligned with industry-recognized standards, if available and appropriate, during the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who took technical skill assessments during the reporting year.	3rd Party Skill Assessment, External--TI Assessments, State Administrative Records, State Assessment Records			84

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators in a given student entry cohort who, anytime in the cohort time frame, received a CTE certificate, diploma, AAS or an AS and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	State Administrative Records, State Student Records	40	46.08	48.5
2015-2016	State Proposed						48.5
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators in a given student entry cohort who, anytime in the cohort time frame, received a CTE certificate, diploma, AAS or an AS and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	State Administrative Records, State Student Records			48.5
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators in a given student entry cohort who, anytime in the cohort time frame, received a CTE certificate, diploma, AAS or an AS and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	State Administrative Records, State Student Records	40	45.79	51
2014-2015	State Proposed						48.5
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators in a given student entry cohort who, anytime in the cohort time frame, received a CTE certificate, diploma, AAS or an AS and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	State Administrative Records, State Student Records			48.5

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators in a given student entry cohort who, in the last year of the cohort time frame, were still intending to complete their program in the declared award, or have transferred to a two-year college or four-year university and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	State Administrative Records, State Student Records	22.5	31.62	32.5
2015-2016	State Proposed						32.5
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators in a given student entry cohort who, in the last year of the cohort time frame, were still intending to complete their program in the declared award, or have transferred to a two-year college or four-year university and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	State Administrative Records, State Student Records			32.5
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE concentrators in a given student entry cohort who, in the last year of the cohort time frame, were still intending to complete their program in the declared award, or have transferred to a two-year college or four-year university and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	State Administrative Records, State Student Records	22.5	32.1	31.75
2014-2015	State Proposed						32.5
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of CTE concentrators in a given student entry cohort who, in the last year of the cohort time frame, were still intending to complete their program in the declared award, or have transferred to a two-year college or four-year university and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Number of CTE concentrators who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	State Administrative Records, State Student Records			32.5

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE completers who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame, and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year, and who were placed or retained in employment, or placed in military service or apprenticeship programs in the 2nd quarter following the program year in which they left post-secondary education (i.e., unduplicated placement status for CTE concentrators who graduated by June 30, 2007 would be assessed between October 1, 2007 and December 31, 2007).	Number of CTE completers who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Employment Wage Record Match,State Developed Surveys	76	84.22	86.5
2015-2016	State Proposed						86.5
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						
2015-2016	Agreed	Number of CTE completers who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame, and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year, and who were placed or retained in employment, or placed in military service or apprenticeship programs in the 2nd quarter following the program year in which they left post-secondary education (i.e., unduplicated placement status for CTE concentrators who graduated by June 30, 2007 would be assessed between October 1, 2007 and December 31, 2007).	Number of CTE completers who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Employment Wage Record Match,State Developed Surveys			86.5
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	Number of CTE completers who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame, and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year, and who were placed or retained in employment, or placed in military service or apprenticeship programs in the 2nd quarter following the program year in which they left post-secondary education (i.e., unduplicated placement status for CTE concentrators who graduated by June 30, 2007 would be assessed between October 1, 2007 and December 31, 2007).	Number of CTE completers who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Employment Wage Record Match,State Developed Surveys	76	84.91	86.5
2014-2015	State Proposed						
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	Number of CTE completers who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame, and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year, and who were placed or retained in employment, or placed in military service or apprenticeship programs in the 2nd quarter following the program year in which they left post-secondary education (i.e., unduplicated placement status for CTE concentrators who graduated by June 30, 2007 would be assessed between October 1, 2007 and	Number of CTE completers who achieved that status anytime during the cohort time frame and were designated as such at the time of the reporting year.	Employment Wage Record Match,State Developed Surveys			86.5

Academic	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement	Baseline	Prior Year Actual	Performance
		December 31, 2007).					

Minnesota - 5P1: Nontraditional Participation

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE participants during the cohort tracking period who were enrolled in a CTE program classified as nontraditional for their gender.	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE participants during the cohort tracking period who were enrolled in a CTE program classified as nontraditional.	State Student Records	16.5	19.9	21.5
2015-2016	State Proposed						21.5
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						
2015-2016	Agreed	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE participants during the cohort tracking period who were enrolled in a CTE program classified as nontraditional for their gender.	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE participants during the cohort tracking period who were enrolled in a CTE program classified as nontraditional.	State Student Records			21.5
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE participants during the cohort tracking period who were enrolled in a CTE program as nontraditional.	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE participants during the cohort tracking period who were enrolled in a CTE program classified as nontraditional.	State Student Records	16.5	19.57	23.5
2014-2015	State Proposed	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE participants during the cohort tracking period who were enrolled in a CTE program classified as nontraditional for their gender.					21.5
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE participants during the cohort tracking period who were enrolled in a CTE program classified as nontraditional for their gender.	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE participants during the cohort tracking period who were enrolled in a CTE program classified as nontraditional.	State Student Records			21.5

Minnesota - 5P2: Nontraditional Completion

Academic Year	Label	Numerator	Denominator	Measurement Approach	Baseline	Prior Year Actual Performance	Performance Target
2015-2016	Prior Year Agreed Data	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE completers in a CTE program classified as nontraditional for their gender.	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE completers in CTE programs classified as nontraditional.	State Student Records	10.5	13.54	14.5
2015-2016	State Proposed						14.5
2015-2016	OCTAE Proposed						
2015-2016	Agreed	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE completers in a CTE program classified as nontraditional for their gender.	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE completers in CTE programs classified as nontraditional.	State Student Records			14.5
2014-2015	Prior Year Agreed Data	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE completers in a CTE program classified as nontraditional for their gender.	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE completers in CTE programs classified as nontraditional.	State Student Records	10.5	13.37	15
2014-2015	State Proposed						14.5
2014-2015	OCTAE Proposed						
2014-2015	Agreed	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE completers in a CTE program classified as nontraditional for their gender.	In a given entry cohort, the number of CTE completers in CTE programs classified as nontraditional.	State Student Records			14.5

**OFFICE OF CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION
PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY BRANCH**

FAUPL REVISION REQUEST FORM

OVERVIEW

1. **State:** Minnesota
2. **Data Owner** (i.e., State, clearinghouse, etc.): **State Academic Assessment System**
3. **Measure Number** (as in FAUPL, ie.6P1): **1S1**
4. **Program Level** (i.e., secondary, postsecondary): **Secondary**
5. **Reason for Revision:** ESEA Waiver Measurement Approach Indicator Definition (Num or Den)
 Student Definition (concentrator/participant) Baseline

6. **Old Definition or Approach:** (*Indicators, student definition, or approach*)

Numerator: Number of CTE concentrators who have met the proficient or advanced level on the Statewide high school reading/language arts assessment administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP) and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.

Denominator: Number of CTE concentrators who took the ESEA assessment in reading/language arts whose scores were included in the State's computation of AYP and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.

7. **New Definition or Approach:** (*Indicators, student definition, or approach*)

Numerator: Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who have met or exceeded the proficiency level on the Statewide high school Reading assessments, either the MCA or MTAS, as administered by the State under Section 1111(b) (3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act, based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP).

Denominator: Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who took the MCA or MTAS and whose high school Reading assessment scores were included in the State's computation of AYP.

8. **General description of the change** (*How does this affect student outcomes/performance?*):

FY2014-15 marks the last year that the GRAD portion of the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) is available as a measure of academic attainment in Reading. We have identified two measures: the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) and the Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) that will replace the GRAD. The majority of students in Minnesota take the MCA; however, many of our Special Education students take the MTAS.

Additionally, this measure will now include participants *and* concentrators. This will help us align state/district achievement efforts with the work carried out in CTE courses. By including more districts and students in this indicator we will be maintaining our high expectations while also communicating the importance and value of aligning our CTE work with statewide achievement efforts.

Because this leads to a change in the definition for this indicator, the target for FY2015-16 will also need to be updated. The target we are proposing is the best baseline estimate available to us, in consideration of the historical performance of CTE students participating in the MCA and MTAS Reading assessments as well as the data trends in the statewide average. For example, new Reading standards were implemented in FY2013 which lead to a decrease in outcomes. Also, as a result of U.S. Department of Education regulations that require states to discontinue alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, MCA-Modified (MOD) will no longer be offered in spring of 2015 or thereafter. Most likely, the MOD students will be assessed using the MTAS which may lead to a slight decrease in the trend data for this indicator.

9. *Rationale or justification for the change (Why is the change necessary?):*

Beginning with the FY2015-16 reporting cycle, a new Academic Attainment measure is needed. We have identified two measures: the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) and the Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS). The majority of students in Minnesota take the MCA; however, many of our Special Education students take the MTAS.

These are the primary assessments used within the state of Minnesota to gauge academic attainment in Reading. We believe these will serve as reliable measures of reading attainment for the Carl Perkins indicator as well.

Additionally, including participants *and* concentrators will help us align state/district achievement efforts with the work carried out in CTE courses. By including more districts and students in this indicator we will be maintaining our high expectations while also communicating the importance and value of aligning our CTE work with statewide achievement efforts.

10. *ESEA waiver (Rationale/Justification and Documentation):*

This information does not apply to the proposed changes outlined above.

**OFFICE OF CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION
PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY BRANCH**

FAUPL REVISION REQUEST FORM

OVERVIEW

1. *State*: Minnesota
2. *Data Owner* (i.e., State, clearinghouse, etc.): **State Academic Assessment System**
3. *Measure Number* (as in FAUPL, ie.6P1): **1S2**
4. *Program Level* (i.e., secondary, postsecondary): **Secondary**
5. *Reason for Revision*: ESEA Waiver Measurement Approach Indicator Definition (Num or Den)
 Student Definition (concentrator/participant) Baseline

6. ***Old Definition or Approach: (Indicators, student definition, or approach)***

Numerator: Number of CTE concentrators who have met the proficient or advanced level on the Statewide high school mathematics assessment administered by the State under Section 1111(b)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP) and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.

Denominator: Number of CTE concentrators who took the ESEA assessment in mathematics whose scores were included in the State's computation of AYP and who, in the reporting year, left secondary education.

7. ***New Definition or Approach: (Indicators, student definition, or approach)***

Numerator: Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who have met or exceeded the proficiency level on the Statewide high school Mathematics assessments, either the MCA or MTAS, as administered by the State under Section 1111(b) (3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act, based on the scores that were included in the State's computation of adequate yearly progress (AYP).

Denominator: Number of 12th grade Participants and Concentrators who took the MCA or MTAS and whose high school Mathematics assessment scores were included in the State's computation of AYP.

8. ***General description of the change (How does this affect student outcomes/performance?):***

FY2014-15 marks the last year that the GRAD portion of the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) is available as a measure of academic attainment in Mathematics. We have identified two measures: the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) and the Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) that will replace the GRAD. The majority of students in Minnesota take the MCA; however, many of our Special Education students take the MTAS.

Additionally, this measure will include participants *and* concentrators. This will help us align state/district achievement efforts with the work carried out in CTE courses. By including more districts and students in this indicator we will be maintaining our high expectations while also communicating the importance and value of aligning our CTE work with statewide achievement efforts.

Because this leads to a change in the definition for this indicator, the target for FY2015-16 will also need to be updated. The target we are proposing is the best baseline estimate available to us, in consideration of the historical performance of CTE students participating in the MCA and MTAS Mathematics assessments as well as the data trends in the statewide average. For example, new Reading standards were implemented in FY2013 which lead to a decrease in outcomes. Also, as a result of U.S. Department of Education regulations that require states to discontinue alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, MCA-Modified (MOD) will no longer be offered in spring of 2015 or thereafter. Most likely, the MOD students will be assessed using the MTAS which may lead to a slight decrease in the trend data for this indicator.

9. *Rationale or justification for the change (Why is the change necessary?):*

Beginning with the FY2015-16 reporting cycle, a new Academic Attainment measure is needed. We have identified two measures: the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) and the Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS). The majority of students in Minnesota take the MCA; however, many of our Special Education students take the MTAS.

These are the primary assessments used within the state of Minnesota to gauge academic attainment in Mathematics. We believe these will serve as reliable measures of mathematics attainment for the Carl Perkins indicator as well.

Additionally, including participants *and* concentrators will help us align state/district achievement efforts with the work carried out in CTE courses. By including more districts and students in this indicator we will be maintaining our high expectations while also communicating the importance and value of aligning our CTE work with statewide achievement efforts.

10. *ESEA waiver (Rationale/Justification and Documentation):*

This information does not apply to the proposed changes outlined above.

OFFICE OF CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY BRANCH

FAUPL REVISION REQUEST FORM

OVERVIEW

1. *State*: Minnesota
2. *Data Owner* (i.e., State, clearinghouse, etc.): **Postsecondary Enrollment**
3. *Measure Number* (as in FAUPL, ie.6P1): **5S1**
4. *Program Level* (i.e., secondary, postsecondary): **Secondary**
5. *Reason for Revision*: ESEA Waiver Measurement Approach Indicator Definition (Num or Den)
 Student Definition (concentrator/participant) Baseline

6. *Old Definition or Approach: (Indicators, student definition, or approach)*

Numerator: Number of Secondary CTE Completers who registered as participating in higher education in a data match through the Minnesota Office of Higher Education.

Denominator: Number of Secondary CTE Completers.

7. *New Definition or Approach: (Indicators, student definition, or approach)*

Numerator: Number of secondary CTE completers, who are registered as participating in higher education through a data match with the Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLEDS), which contains statewide data from the Minnesota Office of Higher Education and nationwide data from the National Clearing House.

Denominator: Number of secondary CTE completers.

8. *General description of the change (How does this affect student outcomes/performance?):*

SLEDS is a data warehouse developed for the purpose of tracking high school to college transitions. Because this information includes nationwide data we will be better able to measure outcomes for CTE students.

The degree to which CTE students move out of state to attend postsecondary is unknown, though we hope using nationwide data will have a positive impact on this indicator. Additionally, across this next year we will be taking a closer look at the methodology used to compile these data and potentially making adjustments. Although the definition of the 5S1 indicator will remain as described above in item seven, the methodological adjustments will have an unknown impact. We are aiming to balance the increase we experience during the FY2013-14 reporting cycle with the proposed methodological changes which we hope will further increase the precision.

9. *Rationale or justification for the change (Why is the change necessary?):*

Align the language in the definition with the analysis to be conducted.

10. *ESEA waiver (Rationale/Justification and Documentation):*

This information does not apply to the proposed changes described above.

**OFFICE OF CAREER, TECHNICAL, AND ADULT EDUCATION
PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY BRANCH**

FAUPL REVISION REQUEST FORM

OVERVIEW

1. *State*: Minnesota
2. *Data Owner* (i.e., State, clearinghouse, etc.): **Postsecondary Enrollment**
3. *Measure Number* (as in FAUPL, ie.6P1): **6S1**
4. *Program Level* (i.e., secondary, postsecondary): **Secondary**
5. *Reason for Revision*: ESEA Waiver Measurement Approach Indicator Definition (Num or Den)
 Student Definition (concentrator/participant) Baseline

6. *Old Definition or Approach: (Indicators, student definition, or approach)*

Numerator: Number of CTE participants from underrepresented gender groups who participated in a CTE program that leads to employment in a nontraditional field during the current reporting year.

Denominator: Number of CTE participants who participated in a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the current reporting year.

7. *New Definition or Approach: (Indicators, student definition, or approach)*

Numerator: Number of CTE students from underrepresented gender groups who enrolled in a CTE program that leads to employment in a nontraditional field, during the current reporting year.

Denominator: Number of CTE students who enrolled in a program that leads to employment in nontraditional fields during the current reporting year.

8. *General description of the change (How does this affect student outcomes/performance?):*

Word change from “participants” to “students;” and from “participated in” to “enrolled in” a CTE program. It is not anticipated that this change in wording will affect student outcomes or performance. The reason we are making this word change is to more accurately reflect the analysis currently being conducted. For the purposes of this indicator, a “CTE student” is defined as any student currently enrolled in a CTE course.

The root-cause of our ‘lower than expected performance for the 6S1 indicator’ has recently been identified; there is an immediate need to align our current data systems. During this coming year we will be working with all haste to align our data systems in order to provide better cohesion and precision. Accomplishing this work will involve an in-depth review process aimed at engaging many vested parties in discussions around nontraditional courses, as well as closely examining trend data and nontraditional information from the National Alliance for Partnership in Equity (NAPE). For these reasons, we have proposed leaving the target at 27.00%.

9. *Rationale or justification for the change (Why is the change necessary?):*

Align the language in the definition with the analysis to be conducted.

10. *ESEA waiver (Rationale/Justification and Documentation):*

This information does not apply to the proposed changes listed above.